On the Casimir operator dependences of QCD amplitudes

T. Grandou[1]

[1] *Université de Nice-Sophia Antipolis,*
Institut Non Linéaire de Nice, UMR CNRS 7335;
*1361 routes des Lucioles, 06560 Valbonne, France**

(Dated: March 3, 2014)

arXiv:1402.7273v1 [hep-th] 28 Feb 2014

Abstract

In eikonal and quenched approximations at least, it is argued that the strong coupling fermionic QCD amplitudes obtained with the help of the newly discovered *effective locality* property, depart from a dependence on the sole $SU_c(3)$ quadratic Casimir operator, evaluated over the fundamental gauge group representation.

This result, in contradistinction with Perturbation Theory, but also with a number of non-perturbative approaches such as the MIT Bag, the Stochastic Vacuum Models, and Lattice simulations, accounts, instead, for the full algebraic content of the rank-2 $SU_c(3)$-Lie algebra.

PACS numbers: 12.38.Cy, 11.10.Wx

Keywords: Non-perturbative QCD, functional methods, random matrices, eikonal, quenching approximations.

*Thierry.Grandou@inln.cnrs.fr

I. INTRODUCTION

In some recent articles [1–4], a new property, which bears on the fermionic Green's functions of QCD, has been put forth under the name of *effective locality*. That property can be phrased as follows. For any Quark/Quark (or Anti-Quark) scattering amplitude, the full gauge-invariant sum of cubic and quartic vectorial gluonic interactions, fermionic loops included, results into a local contact-type interaction, and this local interaction is mediated by a tensorial field structure which is antisymmetric both in Lorentz and color indices. This is a non-expected result because, ordinarily, integrations of elementary degrees of freedom result in highly non-local and non-trivial structures; the 'effective locality' denomination, which sounds like an *oxymoron*, accounts for this rather unusual circumstance.

If effective locality is a sound, relevant property of QCD, then its consequences, even examined 'at tree level', should exhibit admissible as well as new aspects of the confined phase of QCD; and so far, it seems to be so [2–4].

In Ref. [4], a general form of the QCD fermionic amplitudes is displayed as a finite sum of finite products of *Meijer's special functions*, in agreement with most general and theoretical expectations [5]. Remarkably enough, within one and the same expression, these amplitudes are able to show up an explicit link between a *partonic content* and a hadronic non-perturbative component in accord, this time, with the AdS_5/QCD light-cone approach of Ref.[6].

However, the analysis presented in Ref.[4] is carried out at eikonal and quenched approximations. Soon it will become important to relax these approximations, not only for the sake of preserving unitarity, but also in order to explore larger distances: Effective locality, in effect, clearly differentiates QCD from the pure Yang Mills situation. In particular, as noticed by lattice approaches, inclusion of quark loops reveals to be essential to the description of larger distance non-perturbative physics [3].

Fortunately enough, there are things that can be learnt already at the level of a quenched analysis: In the current article, we will take advantage of the results worked out in Ref.[4] to address a peculiar, non-perturbative issue which could account for a novel aspect of the QCD non-perturbative phase, such as disclosed by the property of effective locality.

II. CASIMIR OPERATOR DEPENDENCES

In Perturbation Theory, all of the scattering process calculations come out proportional to either $C_A = N_c$ and/or $C_F = (N_c^2 - 1)/2N_c$, that is to the quadratic Casimir operator eigenvalue $C_2(\mathcal{R})$ over the adjoint and fundamental representations respectively (exceptions may be found in Ref. [7], where higher dimensional representation spaces were considered, but again, restricted to C_2-dependences). The quadratic Casimir definition is $C_2(\mathcal{R}) = \sum_{a=1}^{N_c^2-1} T_a^2(\mathcal{R})$, where the $T_a(\mathcal{R})$ denote the $SU_c(3)$ Lie algebra generators in a given representation $\mathcal{R}$.

Not solely perturbative calculations, but also non-perturbative QCD models, such as the MIT bag model [8], the Stochastic Vacuum Model (SVM) [9], and lattice approaches [7, 10], comply with these overall $C_2(\mathcal{R})$ dependences, though, sometimes, in a quite different way.

The property of effective locality shows up for $2n$-point fermionic Green's functions, as an exact, non-approximate property of QCD [2]. In the strong coupling regime $g >> 1$, evaluating a 2 by 2 Quark/Quark(Anti-Quark) scattering amplitude with the help of *Random Matrix Theory*, one finds a result which (up to renormalization) is proportional to [4],

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(-16\pi\frac{m^2}{E^2})^N \sum_{\text{monomials}} (\pm 1)\,\text{Tr} \prod_{1\le i\le N}^{\sum q_i = N(N-1)/2} [1 - i(-1)^{q_i}] \\
&\times C \int \mathrm{d}p_1 \,..\, \mathrm{d}p_{N(N-1)/2}\; f(p_1,\ldots,p_{N(N-1)/2}) \int_0^{+\infty} \mathrm{d}\alpha_1^i\; \frac{\sin[\alpha_1^i(\mathcal{O}\mathcal{T})_i]}{\alpha_1^i} \int_0^{+\infty} \mathrm{d}\alpha_2^i\; \frac{\sin[\alpha_2^i(\mathcal{O}\mathcal{T})_i]}{\alpha_2^i} \\
&\quad \times G_{34}^{23}\left(iN_c \left(\frac{\alpha_1^i\alpha_2^i}{g\varphi(b)}\right)^2 \frac{\hat{s}(\hat{s}-4m^2)}{2m^4} \,\middle|\, \begin{matrix} \frac{3-2q_i}{4},\ \frac{1}{2},\ 1, \\ \frac{1}{2},\quad \frac{1}{2},\ 1,\ 1 \end{matrix} \right) ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{1}
$$

where the eikonal and quenching approximations have been used. QCD is here simplified to the case of a single quark species of mass m, and $E(= E_1 = E_2)$ is the 2 colliding quarks energy in the center of mass system, $p_1 = (E, 0, 0, p)$, $p_2 = (E, 0, 0, -p)$, $\hat{s} = (p_1 + p_2)^2$. This amplitude easily generalizes to the case of $2n$-point fermionic Green's functions [4, 12]. The monomials which are understood in the summation are those of a *Vandermonde determinant*, comprising $2^{N(N-1)/2}$ terms,

$$
\mathcal{P}(\xi_1,\ldots,\xi_N) = \prod_{1\le i<j\le N} |\xi_i - \xi_j| \; . \tag{2}
$$

Each monomial is characterized (not in a unique way) by a given distribution of q_i-powers whose sum satisfies the constraint of an equal global degree of $N(N-1)/2$. The monomials

share the same algebraic color structure, which is that of the net amplitude. With D, the number of spacetime dimensions, the number $N = D \times (N_c^2 - 1)$ [11] defines the format $N \times N$, of the orthogonal matrix $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}(\dots, p_l, \dots)$, $1 \leq l \leq N(N-1)/2$, introduced so as to diagonalize a real random traceless $N \times N$ symmetric matrix with spectrum, the $\xi_i, 1 \leq i \leq N$. It is by integrating on the $\xi_i s$ (and on 2 subsidiary variables) that the *Meijer*'s special functions, the G_{34}^{23} of (1) come about [4], in agreement with the most general expectations of Ref.[5]. In one and the same argument, the G_{34}^{23} Meijer functions mix up partonic variables $(m, p_1, p_2, \hat{s})$ with the non-perturbative function $\varphi(b) \sim (\mu/\sqrt{\hat{s}})\, e^{-(\mu b)^{2-\xi}}$, where $b = |\vec{b}|$ is the impact parameter of the scattering process, and μ, the mass scale necessarily introduced by effective locality [4].

Also, writing (1), the absolute values of (2) have been dropped, as it can be shown that they do not affect the point made in the current letter [12].

The matter under consideration is in the 2nd line of (1) where $f(.., p_l, .)$ is the joint probability distribution of the $N(N-1)/2$-parameters that specify the orthogonal matrix $\mathcal{O}$, whereas the constant C normalizes that distribution to unity. The matricial part of (1) appears in the 2 *sine functions*, while a trace over internal color degrees may be taken.

One has the N-vector of matrices $\mathcal{T} = (T, T, T, T) = (1, 1, 1, 1) \otimes T$, that is $D = 4$ copies of the original full set T of $SU_c(3)$ generators, taken in the fundamental representation: $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_7, t_8\}$, with $t_a = \lambda_a/2$, the standard Gell-Mann matrices [13].

As advertised in Ref.[4], the additional, but unavoidable complexity coming from the p_l-dependence of the random orthogonal matrix, $\mathcal{O}$, is essential to prevent a trivial result from occuring, and to begin with, it is interesting to observe how such a trivial result would effectively come out.

Ignoring the p_l-dependent orthogonal matrix $\mathcal{O}$ in the second line of (1), one gets for a generic monomial of the sum (1),

$$\pm \,\mathrm{Tr} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq N}^{\sum q_i = N(N-1)/2} [1 - i(-1)^{q_i}] \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}\alpha_1^i \, \frac{\sin(\alpha_1^i \mathcal{T}_i)}{\alpha_1^i} \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}\alpha_2^i \, \frac{\sin(\alpha_2^i \mathcal{T}_i)}{\alpha_2^i} \, G_{34}^{23}\left(C^{st}(\alpha_1^i \alpha_2^i)^2 | \dots\right) , \tag{3}$$

that is,

$$\pm \,\mathrm{Tr} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq N} [1 - i(-1)^{q_i}] \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}\alpha_1^i \, \frac{\sin \alpha_1^i}{\alpha_1^i} \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}\alpha_2^i \, \frac{\sin \alpha_2^i}{\alpha_2^i} \, G_{34}^{23}\left(C^{st}(\alpha_1^i \alpha_2^i)^2 | \dots\right) \frac{\lambda_{\hat{i}}^2}{4} . \tag{4}$$

Expanding the sine-functions, the property $\mathcal{T}_j = t_{\widehat{j}} = \lambda_{\widehat{i}}/2$ has been used, where $\widehat{i} = i$ *modulo* $N_c^2 - 1$. Now, the following equalities hold,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{T}_j^2 = \left(\prod_{a=1}^{N_c^2-1=8} \frac{1}{4}\lambda_a^2 \right)^4 = \left(\prod_{a=1}^{7} \frac{1}{4}\lambda_a^2 \right) (\frac{1}{4}\lambda_8^2)^4 = \mathbf{0}_{3\times 3}\, (\frac{1}{4}\lambda_8^2)^4 = 0\,. \tag{5}$$

The first equalities hold by definition of the N-vector of matrices $\mathcal{T}$, and because of the relations $[\lambda_a^2, \lambda_b^2] = 0\,, \forall a, b = 1, 2, .., N_c^2 - 1$; the last equalities can be checked either by a direct evaluation at $N_c = 3$, using standard Gell-Mann matrices, or by writing each of the $N_c^2 - 1$-*endomorphisms* λ_a^2, as a *direct sum* of projectors.

Restoring the relevant dependences on $\mathcal{O}$ now, one can write for a given monomial of the sum (1),

$$\pm \,\mathrm{Tr} \prod_{1\le i\le N}^{\sum q_i = N(N-1)/2} [1 - i(-1)^{q_i}] \int_0^\infty \frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_1^i}{\alpha_1^i} \int_0^\infty \frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2^i}{\alpha_2^i}\; G_{34}^{23}\left(C^{st}(\alpha_1^i\alpha_2^i)^2|\,\ldots\right)$$
$$\times C \int \mathrm{d}^{N(N-1)/2}\mathbf{p}\; f(\mathbf{p}) (\sum_{k_i=0}^{\infty} \{k_i, \alpha_1^i\}\, (\mathcal{O}^{ij}(\mathbf{p})\mathcal{T}_j)^{2k_i+1}) (\sum_{k_i'=0}^{\infty} \{k_i', \alpha_2^i\}\, (\mathcal{O}^{ij}(\mathbf{p})\mathcal{T}_j)^{2k_i'+1})\,, \tag{6}$$

where shorthand notations have been used: The set of (yet unspecified) real numbers $p_l,\ 1 \le l \le N(N-1)/2$ is collectively represented by the symbol $\mathbf{p}$, and the notation $\{k_i, \alpha_1^i\}$ stands for the general term of the sine-function expansions $(-1)^{k_i}(\alpha_1^i)^{2k_i+1}/(2k_i+1)!$.

Random orthogonal matrices can be generated in different ways, distributed according to the *Haar measure* over the orthogonal group $O_N(\mathbb{R})$, [14]. An orthogonal matrix can be conveniently decomposed into a finite product of $N(N-1)/2$ *rotators*, plus reflections, that is under the form,

$$\mathcal{O} = (R_{12}R_{13}\ldots R_{1N})\,(R_{23}R_{24}\ldots R_{2N})\ldots\ldots(R_{N-1,N})\,D_\varepsilon\,, \tag{7}$$

where the matrix of reflections is diagonal by definition and reads, $D_\varepsilon = diag(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \ldots, \varepsilon_N)$, with $\varepsilon_i = \pm 1,\ \forall i = 1, \ldots, N$. A random orthogonal matrix requires that to either value $\varepsilon_i = \pm 1$ be associated an equal probability $P(\varepsilon_i = \pm 1) = 1/2$. A rotator $R_{ij}(\Theta_{ij})$, itself an $N \times N$-orthogonal matrix, acts as a rotation in the $i-j$ 2-plane solely, and is thus characterized by an angle, Θ_{ij}. The Θ_{ij} are independent random variables with a joint probability distribution proportional to [14],

$$\prod_{j=2}^{N} \cos^{j-2}\Theta_{1j} \prod_{j=3}^{N} \cos^{j-3}\Theta_{2j} \cdots \prod_{j=N}^{N} \cos^{j-N}\Theta_{N-1,j}\,, \tag{8}$$

whereas the probability density of an angle Θ_{ij} is a *beta* distribution, $\beta(x_{ij};\frac{a}{2},\frac{b}{2})$, with $\cos\Theta_{ij}=\sqrt{x_{ij}}$, that is, $\beta(x_{ij};\frac{a}{2},\frac{b}{2})=x_{ij}^{a/2\,-1}(1-x_{ij})^{b/2\,-1}/B(\frac{a}{2},\frac{b}{2})$. As meant in the second line of (6), these probability densities allow one to calculate averages over orthogonal matrices in a definite quantitative way. However, for our present purpose, the full explicit form of the Haar measure is not required, but only the D_ε matrix properties, so as the *left-* and *right- invariances* of the Haar measure on $O_N(\mathbb{R})$. For example, denoting with brackets those averages, and by $a^{ij}=a^{ij}(\dots,\Theta_{lm},\dots)$ the matrix elements of (7) as the reflection matrix D_ε is omitted, one obtains,

$$<\mathcal{O}^{ij}\mathcal{T}_j\mathcal{O}^{ik}\mathcal{T}_k>_{\varepsilon,\Theta}=<\varepsilon_j a^{ij}(\Theta)\,\varepsilon_k a^{ik}(\Theta)\mathcal{T}_j\mathcal{T}_k>_{\varepsilon,\Theta}=\frac{\delta_{jk}}{N}\;<a^{ij}(\Theta)a^{ik}(\Theta)>_\Theta\,\mathcal{T}_j\mathcal{T}_k\,. \tag{9}$$

In the last equality, the normalized average over the product of reflections $\varepsilon_j\varepsilon_k$ has been taken. That is,

$$<\mathcal{O}^{ij}\mathcal{T}_j\mathcal{O}^{ik}\mathcal{T}_k>_{\varepsilon,\Theta}=\frac{1}{N}<\sum_{j=1}^{N}a_{ij}^2(\dots\Theta_{lm}\dots)>_\Theta\;\mathcal{T}_j^2\equiv K_{00}\sum_j\mathcal{T}_j^2=K_{00}\,DC_{2f}\,\mathbf{1}_{N_c\times N_c}\,, \tag{10}$$

where, as a straight forward consequence of the left- and right- invariances of the Haar measure on $O_N(\mathbb{R})$, [12], the second equality defines independently of the entry labels i,j the constant K_{00} as N^{-1} times the mean value $<a_{ij}^2(\dots\Theta_{lm}\dots)>_\Theta$. Finally, C_{2f} stands for the quadratic Casimir operator eigenvalue on the fundamental representation, that is, $C_{2f}=C_F=4/3$.

The right hand side of Eq.(10) just gives the contribution to (6) of the values $k_i=k_i'=0$ coming from the two sine function expansions,

$$\pm\mathrm{Tr}\prod_{i=1}^{N}[1-i(-1)^{q_i}]\;\prod_{J=1}^{2}\int_0^\infty\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_J^i}{\alpha_J^i}\{0,\alpha_J^i\}\,G_{34}^{23}\left(C^{st}(\alpha_1^i\alpha_2^i)^2|\dots\right)\;K_{00}\,DC_{2f}\,\mathbf{1}_{N_c\times N_c} \tag{11}$$

In the same way, at $k_i=1,k_i'=0$, one gets,

$$\begin{aligned}&\pm\,\mathrm{Tr}\prod_{i=1}^{N}\,[1-i(-1)^{q_i}]\;\int_0^\infty\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_1^i}{\alpha_1^i}\{1,\alpha_1^i\}\int_0^\infty\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_2^i}{\alpha_2^i}\{0,\alpha_2^i\}\,G_{34}^{23}\left(C^{st}(\alpha_1^i\alpha_2^i)^2|\dots\right)\\&\times K_{10}\,\left((DC_{2f})^2+(DC_{3f})\right)\mathbf{1}_{N_c\times N_c}\,,\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where K_{10} stands for N^{-1} times the angular averages $<a_{ij}^2a_{ik}^2>_\Theta$ [12]. Of course, the same contribution is generated by the reverse case $k_i=0,k_i'=1$, with $K_{01}=K_{10}$. In (12), one

notices the second (cubic) Casimir operator eigenvalue over the fundamental representation of $SU_c(3)$, that is

$$\sum_{a,b,c=1}^{N_c^2-1} d_{abc}\, t^a t^b t^c \equiv C_{3f} \mathbf{1}_{N_c \times N_c} \ , \tag{13}$$

where the fully symmetric constants d_{abc} are defined in the standard way, that is, in the case of interest, at $N_c = 3$, $\{t_a, t_b\} = d_{abc} t_c + \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ab}$. Far less popular than C_2, the cubic Casimir operator eigenvalue over a representation space specified by the *Young Tableaux* parameters (p, q) is given by,

$$C_3(p,q) = \frac{1}{18}(p-q)(2p+q+3)(2q+p+3), \tag{14}$$

that is, $C_{3f} = C_3(1,0) = 10/9$ over the $SU(3)$ fundamental representation [15], whereas it is zero over the adjoint representation $(1,1)$, another salient feature of the distinction between QCD and the pure Yang-Mills case.

At next order, corresponding in the expansion (6) to the terms $\{1, \alpha_1^i\} \times \{1, \alpha_2^i\}$, $\{2, \alpha_1^i\} \times \{0, \alpha_2^i\}$ and $\{0, \alpha_1^i\} \times \{2, \alpha_2^i\}$, one has again the same overall constant $K_{20} = K_{02} = K_{11}$ [12], but the total contribution, related to the $O_N(\mathbb{R})$-averaged value of $(\mathcal{O}^{ij}(\mathbf{p})\mathcal{T}_j)^6$, becomes much more intricate; to wit, the equivalent of the second line in Eq.(12) is now,

$$K_{11} \left\{ \left(2(DC_{2f})^2 + (DC_{2f})(DC_{3f}) + \frac{4}{3}(DC_{3f}) \right) \mathbf{1}_{3\times 3} \right.$$
$$\left. + \sum_{k,j,l,h,m} d_{kjm} d_{khl} \left(T_j T_m T_h T_l + 2 T_j T_h T_l T_m \right) \right\} . \tag{15}$$

The two last terms, somewhat puzzling, seem to compromise the general structure of these expansions. To proceed, one may rely on the standard values of the d_{abc} coefficients, such as given in the $SU_c(3)$ algebra Gell-Mann basis [13]. Then, one can work out identities such as,

$$\sum_{k,j=1}^{8} d_{kjj} = 0, \qquad \sum_{j,m=1}^{8} d_{k'jm} d_{kjm} = \frac{5}{3}\, \delta_{k'k} \, , \tag{16}$$

that can be used to prove that expression (15) indeed reduces to,

$$K_{11} \left([2 + (\frac{5}{6})^2](DC_{2f})^2 + (DC_{2f})(DC_{3f}) + 3(DC_{3f}) \right) \mathbf{1}_{3\times 3} \, . \tag{17}$$

An analysis of the higher order terms of (6) is likely to become rapidly intractable and not very useful to the purpose of re-summing the whole sine function series. Fortunately,

the full treatment can be carried out with the help of a summation over Random Matrices and it will be presented elsewhere [12].

III. CONCLUSION

With Eqs.(11), (12) and (17), the point of the present letter is reached. At quenched and eikonal approximations at least, the strong coupling QCD fermionic amplitudes exhibit a behaviour that, contrarily to usual results, is no longer dependent on the first, quadratic Casimir operator alone, $C_{2f}\mathbf{1}_{3\times 3}$, but also on the second, cubic Casimir operator, $C_{3f}\mathbf{1}_{3\times 3}$. This feature, given the rank-2 character of the $SU_c(3)$-color algebra, had to come into play in one way or another. It is here made visible on the generic form of the strong coupling fermionic QCD amplitudes such as derived in Ref.[4], thanks to the property of effective locality [1, 2]. That property, which goes along with a mass scale [4], is non-perturbative, the gluonic degrees of freedom being integrated out.

It is interesting to note that this property leads to a description of any $2n$-point fermionic Green's function in terms of C_{2f} and C_{3f}, which, in *Quark Models* without gluons, correspond to 2- and 3-body potential interactions, with the latter bringing about significant improvements to a description based on a sole 2-body potential [16]. As is well-known in atomic and nuclear physics, that point seems to be generic of a variety of similar situations: In the case of *shallow systems* it has been shown that, at leading order, the only potentials that are necessary to a complete description of an n-body system, are the 2- and 3-body interaction potentials; and that the sole 2-body potential is not enough, whatever the parametrizations one tries to complete that 2-body description with [17].

Further on, it will be worth analyzing how the eikonal and quenching approximations affect those Casimir operator dependences, and also to give numerical estimates [12].

Acknowledgments

It is a pleasure to thank H.M. Fried for a careful reading of the manuscript, and M. Gattobigio for having provided references most relevant to the subject.

[1] H. M. Fried, Y. Gabellini, T. Grandou and Y.-M. Sheu, Eur. Phys. J. **C65**, (2010) 395.

[2] H. M. Fried, T. Grandou and Y.-M. Sheu, Ann. Phys. **327** (2012) 2666-2690.

[3] H. M. Fried, Y. Gabellini, T. Grandou and Y.-M. Sheu, Ann. Phys., **338** (2013) 107-122.

[4] H. M. Fried, T. Grandou and Y.-M. Sheu, Ann. Phys., (2014), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aop.2014.02.015 .

[5] D.D. Ferrante, G.S. Guralnik, Z. Guralnik and C. Pehlevan, BROWN-HET-1611(Nov. 2011).

[6] G.F. de Téramond and S.J. Brodsky, arXiv:1203.4025 [hep-ph] (2012); G. F. de Teramond, S. J. Brodsky and H. G. Dosch, arXiv:1401.5531 [hep-ph].

[7] G.S. Bali, Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000) 114503; Nucl.Phys.Proc.Suppl. **83** (2000) 422; S. Delgar, Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000) 034509; Nucl.Phys.Proc.Suppl. **73** (1999) 587.

[8] K. Johnson and C.B. Thorn, Phys. Rev. D **13** (1976) 1934; T.H. Hansson, Phys. Lett. B **166** (1986) 343.

[9] H.G. Dosch and Y.A. Simonov, Phys. Lett. B **205** (1988) 339.

[10] B. Müller, private communication.

[11] M. B. Halpern, Phys. Rev. D**16**, (1977) 1788.

[12] T. Grandou, work in progress.

[13] F.J. Yndurain, *Quantum Chromodynamics*, Texts and Monographs in Physics, Springer-Verlag, 1983.

[14] T.W. Anderson, I. Olkin, and L.G. Underhill, Econometric Workshop, Technical Report N06, Stanford University, California, August 1985.

[15] A. Kundu, *Elementary Discussions on Group Theory*, Calcutta University PG-I and PG-II.

[16] V. Dmitrasinovic, Phys. Lett. B **499** (2001) 135.

[17] H.W. Hammer, A. Nogga and A. Schwenk, Rev. Mod. Phys. **85** (2013) 197; M. Gattobigio and A. Kievsky, arXiv:1309.1927 (2013).